UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/770,433	02/02/2004	Adam Leslie Clark	40006997-0005-002	3363

26263   7590   02/01/2008
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER
TSAI, TSUNG YIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/770,433	CLARK, ADAM LESLIE
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Tsung-Yin Tsai	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after t he mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _04 January 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,5-15 and 17-23_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,5-15 and 17-23_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _02 February 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAIL ACTION

Acknowledge of amendment received on 1/4/2008 and made of record.

Acknowledge of amendment to claims 1, 14-15 and 17.

Acknowledge of cancelling claims 4 and 16.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument – Page 6 regarding the new limitation of claim 1.

Examiner's response – The combine teachings of Yajima et al and Chen teaches the limitation that is amended by the applicant. Please see the 103 rejection below.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

   (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) in view of Chen (US Patent Number 5,974,172).

   Yajima et al teaches a method of decoding an encoded video file and pixel (the file is compose of pixels, each pixel is process individually), comprising:

(1) Regarding claims 1 and 14:

receiving the encoded video file, wherein the encoded video file (abstract, figure 1, column 1 lines 20-45) includes a plurality of encoded video data tables (column 1 lines 20-45, column 2 lines 40-50, column 3 lines 1-15) and a plurality of reference pixel value sets (abstract, column 1 lines 30-35, column 2 lines 35-40, column 3 lines 1-15),

the **reference pixel value sets** (abstract, figure 1, column lines 50-55, column 2 lines 35-40, column 3 lines 20-25) **corresponding to those pixels** (column 3 lines 1-30 discloses regarding pixels for the data tables for the encoding and decoding) **having most significant color component intensity values for pixel within a video frame** from which the **encoded video data table** (column 1 lines 20-45, column 2 lines 40-50, column 3 lines 1-15) **were produced** (column 3 lines 1-15);

decoding the plurality of encoded video data tables (abstract, figure 1, column 1 lines 45-60, column 2 lines 35-40, column 3 lines 15-35) using the plurality of **reference pixel value sets** (abstract, figure 1, column lines 50-55, column 2 lines 35-40, column 3 lines 20-25); and

returning decoded video data (column 2 lines 1-10).

Yajima et al does not teach regarding where **most significant color component intensity values** for pixel within **a video frame**.

However, Chen teaches regarding **most significant color component intensity values** (column 5 lines 5-30 discloses frame data must assign color or

intensity to each pixel and where these pixel constitute the frame data that

defines the video frames, since these are the pixel that will define the video

frames it is seen as the most significant pixel values) **for pixel within a video

frame** (column 5 lines 5-30).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Chen teachings to Yajima et al regarding **most significant

color component intensity values for pixel within a video frame**.

To motivation to combine is advantageously since encoding frame data is

of using industry standard encoders while will providing content based scalability

(column 2 lines 40-50).

(2) Regarding claim 17:

Yajima et al further teaches:

wherein the plurality of dominant color values comprises a red value, a

blue value, and a green value (abstract, column 1 lines 25-67, column 3 lines 1-

35, column 4 lines 25-44. The line buffer functions as a reference pixel

generating mean for generating reference pixels for the input image data stream.

Since the only color incoming data stream are only of red, green and blue, these

will be the plurality of dominate color values to determine the reference color.).

5.   Claims 2-3, 5, 8, 10-11, 15 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) and Chen (US

Patent Number 5,974,172) in view of Lambert et al (US Patent Number 4,730,214).

(1) Regarding claims 2 and 15:

Yajima et al teaches analyzing each encoded video (column 2 lines 1-10) data table (abstract, figure 25, column 1 lines 20-45) of the plurality of encoded video data tables sequentially (figure 4), wherein each encoded video data table (abstract, figure 25, column 1 lines 20.45, column 3 lines 1-15) represents an encoded video frame (column 2 lines 1-10); decomposing each encoded video data table into a plurality of rows (column 1 lines 30-35 shows how data is stream into the line buffer rows to determine reference pixels), for each row, determining a reference pixel parameter set of the plurality of reference pixel parameter (figure 1, column 1 lines 20-45, column 2 lines 35-50) sets by looking-up the dominant color value (column 2 lines 35-45) within the plurality of reference pixel value sets (column 2 lines 40-45); storing the pixel color parameter set into a decoded row in a decoded video data table (abstract, figure 1, figure 24, column 1 lines 45-60, column 2 lines 40-50, column 3 lines 15-30).

Yajija et al does not teach wherein each row includes a dominant color value, a scaled color value, and a scaled value set; and multiplying the scaled value set by the reference pixel parameter set to provide an expanded value set; multiplying the scaled color value by the reference pixel parameter set to provide a pixel color parameter set.

However, Lambert et al teaches wherein each row includes a dominant color value (column 1 lines 50-57. Intensity value is seen as the dominate value.), a scaled color value (column 1 lines 50-57. Not only grey scale values,

but also for the familiar red, green and blue color scale values.), and a scaled

value set (column 1 lines 50-57); and multiplying the scaled value set by the

reference pixel parameter set to provide an expanded value set (column 1 lines

50-57, column 6 lines 40-61. Adjusting is seen as the multiplication function of in

scaling the reference value set to become the expended value set for display.);

multiplying the scaled color value by the reference pixel parameter set to provide

a pixel color parameter set (column 1 lines 50-57, column 6 lines 40-61.

Adjusting is seen as the multiplication function of in scaling the reference value

set to become the expended value set for display.).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Lambert et al teaching to Yajija et al regarding each row

includes a dominant color value, a scaled color value, and a scaled value set and

multiplying the scaled value set by the reference pixel parameter set to provide

an expanded value set; multiplying the scaled color value by the reference pixel

parameter set to provide a pixel color parameter set, such that using of the

scaled value upon the reference/dominate values will produce a set of desired

data signal from the data set (column 4 lines 1-5) and there will be no deviation

from the original data set, and this will thereby reduce the likelihood of data

corruption.

(2) Regarding claim 3:

Yajima et al teaches regarding wherein each encoded video data table of

the plurality of encoded video data tables includes a plurality of rows, wherein

each row of the plurality of rows includes a dominant color value of a plurality of dominant color values

Yajima et al does not teach regarding scaled color value of a plurality of color values, and a scaled value set of a plurality of scaled value sets.

However, Lambert et al teaches regarding scaled color value (column 1 lines 50-57) of a plurality of color values (column 1 lines 55-57), and a scaled value set of a plurality of scaled value sets (column 1 lines 55-57.).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Lambert et al teaching to Yajija et al regarding scaled color value of a plurality of color values and a scaled value set of a plurality of scaled value sets, such that using of the scaled value upon the reference/dominate values will produce a set of desired data signal from the data set (column 4 lines 1-5) and no deviation (column 2 lines 5-10) from the original data, and this will thereby reduce the likelihood of data corruption.

(3) Regarding claim 5:

Yajima et al further teaches wherein the plurality of dominant color values comprises a red value, a blue value, and a green value (abstract, column 1 lines 25-67, column 3 lines 1-35, column 4 lines 25-44. The line buffer functions as a reference pixel generating mean for generating reference pixels for the input image data stream. Since the only color incoming data stream are only of red, green and blue, these will be the plurality of dominate color values to determine the reference color.).

(4) Regarding claim 8:

Yajima et al further teaches wherein decoding the plurality of encoded video data tables (column 1 lines 45-60, column 2 lines 1-10, column 2 lines 40-50) further comprises constructing the decoded video data (column 1 lines 45-60) from a plurality of the decoded video data table (column 1 lines 45-60, column 2 lines 40-50, column 3 line 15-35.).

(5) Regarding claims 10 and 21:

Yajima et al teaches all that is mention above.

Yajima et al does not teach regarding expanded the expanded chrominance value, and expanded luminance value.

However, Lambert et al teaches regarding expanding values (column 6 lines 45-63. Adjusting that is used in this sense is seen as expanding the given data values that are encoded. Note that chrominance and luminance are inherit values that are traditionally collected.)

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Lambert et al teachings to Yajima et al regarding expanding the data values, such that using of the scaled value upon the reference/dominate values will produce the desire signals from the data set (column 4 lines 1-5) and no deviation (column 2 lines 5-10) from the original data set, and this will thereby reduce the integrity of the expanded data set.

(6) Regarding claims 11 and 22:

wherein the pixel color parameter set include one or more of RGB values,

CMYK values, component video values, and composite video values (These are

inherent values that are collected by traditional method to recreate the values of

the pixel.).

6.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et

al (5,764,804) and Chen (US Patent Number 5,974,172) in view of Ando et al

(6,662,309 B2).

(1) Regarding claim 9:

Yajima et al teaches about decoding the encoded video file information by

reversing what was encoded.

Yajima et al does not teach about headers.

However, Ando et al teaches about header (figure 23. Figure 23 shows

that header of different sorts that gives instructions regarding the processes of

the data.)

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Ando et al teachings to Yajima et al regarding header, such

that when the apparatus receiving the encoded data table processing it will

process the data frame group back into the accuracy format.

7.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima

et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) and Chen (US Patent Number 5,974,172) in view

of Lambert et al (US Patent Number 4,730,214) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Ando et al (6,662,309 B2).

(1) Regarding claim 12:

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, teaches regarding encoded file.

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, does not teach about network files server.

However, Ando et al teaches regarding network file server (column 11 lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Ando et al teachings to Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, regarding network file server, such that it would be a secure and efficient way to transfer data file from one location to another.

8.   Claims 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) and Chen (US Patent Number 5,974,172) in view of Lambert et al (US Patent Number 4,730,214 as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Ando et al (6,662,309 B2).

(1) Regarding claim 20:

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, teaches about decoding the encoded video file information by reversing what was encoded.

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, does not teach about headers.

However, Ando et al teaches about header (figure 23. Figure 23 shows that header of different sorts that gives instructions regarding the processes of the data.)

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Ando et al teachings to Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, regarding header, such that when the apparatus receiving the encoded data table processing it will process the data frame group back into the accuracy format and reduce the likelihood of outputting corrupt data set.

(2) Regarding claim 23:

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, teaches regarding encoded file.

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, does not teach about network files server.

However, Ando et al teaches regarding network file server (column 11 lines 45-60).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Ando et al teachings to Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, regarding network file server, such that it would be a secure and efficient way to transfer data file from one location to another.

9.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) and Chen (US Patent Number 5,974,172) in view

of Lambert et al (US Patent Number 4,730,214 as applied to claim 2 above, and further

in view of Kubota et al (US 2003/0084462 A1)

(1) Regarding claim 13:

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, teaches regarding decoded video

file table.

Yajima et al, as modified by Lambert, does not teach broadcasting

protocol include NTSC, PAL, SECAM, RGB, CMYK, and HDTV.

However, Kubota et al teaches regarding broadcasting protocol include

NTSC, PAL, SECAM, RGB, CMYK, and HDTV (page 1 paragraph 0007, page 7

paragraph 0101).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ Kubota et al teachings to Yajima et al, as modified by

Lambert, regarding broadcasting protocol include NTSC, PAL, SECAM, RGB,

CMYK, and HDTV, such that it conforms with establish broadcasting standard for

data transfer and display for the viewers.

10.   Claims 6 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) and Chen (US Patent Number 5,974,172)

in view of Evelin (US Patent Number 5,083,195).

(1) Regarding claims 6 and 18:

Yajima et al teaches regarding plurality of reference pixel value sets (figure 49 step 132-134 teaches the input of the image and output input reference pixel and 2D array reference pixels).

Yajima et al does not teach wherein the plurality of reference pixel value sets includes a red reference pixel value set, a blue reference pixel value set, a green reference pixel value set, and a black reference pixel value set.

However, Evelin teaches regarding where wherein the plurality of reference pixel value sets includes a red reference pixel value set, a blue reference pixel value set, a green reference pixel value set, and a black reference pixel value set (column 2 lines 5-20 discloses where the embodiment comprises these reference pixel for the phosphors of CRT. Furthermore, Examiner does not seen a point for a black reference pixel value set. The color code for black is just a series of zeros, where the length of series of zeros depends on the capabilities of bit strings of the monitor can display, therefore, a series of zeros is no need for comparison to another series of zeros that represent the color black to be compare).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Evelin teachings to Yajima et al regarding using reference pixel values such as red, blue and green. Having reference values to compare will enable the display of these colors to compensate and adjust the display for better viewing.

The motivation to combine these teachings will enable a color display to

compensate for changes in its optical characteristics and for any changes in the

ambient lighting conditions (column 1 lines 40-50), as well as enabling the

individual aging of one of the phosphors to be determined and corrected without

affecting the others (column 1 lines 55-60).

11.   Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yajima et al (US Patent Number 5,764,804) and Chen (US Patent Number 5,974,172)

in view of Evelin (US Patent Number 5,083,195) as applied to claims 6 and 18,

repetitively, above, and further in view of Carr (US Patent Number 6,118,823).

(1) Regarding claims 7 and 19:

Yajima et al and Evelin teaches regarding plurality of reference pixel value

sets (Yajima et al , figure 49 step 132-134 teaches the input of the image and output input

reference pixel and 2D array reference pixels) and reference color value set (Evelin,

column 2 lines 5-20 discloses where the embodiment comprises these reference

pixel for the phosphors of CRT).

Yajima et al does not teach regarding a reference chrominance value and

a reference luminance value.

However, Carr teaches regarding reference chrominance value and a

reference luminance value (figure 10 discloses luminance reference values to

luminance subtractor logic and chrominance reference values to gram buffer).

It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Carr teachings to Yajima et al and Evelin regarding having reference chrominance value and a reference luminance value. Having reference values to compare will enable the display of these colors to compensate and adjust the display for better viewing.

The motivation to combine these teachings enhanced addressing control scheme for a frame difference unit which is capable of writing and reading luminance and chrominance data, at the same time, to and from the predicted array, while maintaining the order of the data written the same as the output order of the data to be sent. Further, the present invention addresses the problem of controlling shared access to the shared-use predicted error array of the frame difference unit (column 2 lines 15-25).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tsung-Yin Tsai whose telephone number is (571) 270-1671. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8 am - 5 pm ESP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jingge Wu can be reached on (571)272-7429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tsung-Yin Tsai
January 31, 2008

JINGGE WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER